DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 027 HE 014 713

AUTHOR Dahl, Randall W.
TITLE The Implementation of Educational Plans of Kentucky High School Graduates: Selected Results from the Kentucky Longitudinal Study.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Joint Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research and the North Carolina Association for Institutional Research (Charlotte, NC, October 29-30, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Aspiration; *College Attendance; *College Bound Students; *College Choice; Comparative Analysis; *Enrollment Influences; Family Characteristics; Followup Studies; Higher Education; High School Graduates; Longitudinal Studies; *Noncollege Bound Students; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky

ABSTRACT

Personal and academic background characteristics of 1980 Kentucky high school graduates and the influence of these factors on the graduates' educational plans in general, and the relationship between the students' college of choice and the actual institution in which they enrolled were studied. The analysis was based on data drawn from an initial survey and first followup survey of the Kentucky Longitudinal Study. In general, the first followup survey results indicate that the vast majority of 1980 Kentucky high school graduates followed through on their general post-high school plans. Eighty percent of the 1980 graduates who planned to enroll in postsecondary educational institution actually enrolled, while 20 percent of the graduates with noneducation plans (employment) enrolled in some form of postsecondary education. Enrollments by type of institution are examined. College bound students who subsequently enrolled or did not enroll in postsecondary education differed significantly on all six academic background variables: the enrolled group was characterized by higher academic performance and abilities. The enrolled group had significantly higher family incomes, parental education levels, and personal educational aspirations than those who did not enroll, and also were more often from urban areas. Graduates who implemented their specific educational plans by enrolling in their respective expected institutions had significantly higher academic performance in high school and self-ratings on school-related abilities than those who enrolled in institutions different than originally planned. The two groups also differed in personal background characteristics. A list of variables used in the initial survey is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211027

The Implementation of Educational Plans of Kentucky High School Graduates: Selected Results from the Kentucky Longitudinal Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CONTRIBUTED PAPER

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Randall Dahl
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Randall W. Dahl
Associate Director for Policy Studies
Kentucky Council on Higher Education

SAIR/NCAIR Conference
Charlotte, NC
October 29, 1981

HE 014 713

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL PLANS OF KENTUCKY HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES: SELECTED RESULTS FROM THE KENTUCKY LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Choices made by students are critical variables in the operation of institutions and systems of higher education. The effectiveness of planning at both the institutional and system level depends in part upon a knowledge of the educational choices students actually make as well as an understanding of the factors and conditions that influence those choices. Among the numerous and wide variety of educational choices students can and do make, few are more important to higher education planning than the basic decisions (1) to attend an institution of higher education, and (2) to attend a particular institution of higher education. These very basic educational choices of students have been addressed in a variety of studies during the past two decades, but much remains to be learned.

Background and Purpose

This paper presents results and preliminary analyses from both the initial survey of plans and follow-up phases of the "Kentucky Longitudinal Study" focusing on the implementation of educational plans and specific institutional choices of May 1980 graduates of Kentucky high schools. In particular, the analyses focus on a number of personal and academic background characteristics of the graduates and the influence of these factors on the graduates' educational plans and implementation thereof. The specific concerns of this study were (1) the implementation of post-high school educational plans in general, and (2) the implementation of specific institutional choices or "initial retention" in terms of actual enrollment in the graduate's intended or expected postsecondary institution. This paper focuses on the characteristics distinguishing those who implemented their plans from those who did not.

Methodology

This exploratory analysis was based on data drawn from both the initial survey and first follow-up survey of the Kentucky Longitudinal Study, a major statewide educational research project of the Kentucky Council on Higher Education. This study was initiated in April 1980 with the statewide administration of a survey of educational and career plans which was completed by more than 30,000 May 1980 graduating seniors in Kentucky public and non-public high schools. In late 1980 the first follow-up survey of this twelve-year study was completed by 2,600 May 1980 graduates participating in one of three follow-up samples. (Subsequent follow-up surveys are to be conducted annually.)

Data from the follow-up survey included fall 1980 postsecondary education enrollment status and specific postsecondary institution if enrolled. Data from the initial survey of plans completed by all respondents shortly before graduation from high school included self-reported information on prior academic performance (grades in selected subject areas and class standing), self-assessment of ability level on a variety of school-related and career-related characteristics (e.g., academic motivation, mechanical ability, creative writing ability, ability to work with others), personal and family background (urban/rural location, parental education, and family income), and educational aspirations (degree level). For education-bound graduates, additional information concerning the relative importance of certain factors in selecting the graduate's expected postsecondary institution was also available.

The analyses consisted of (1) comparisons of group means and (2) step-wise discriminant analyses (employing SPSS Sub-Programs

T-TEST and DISCRIMINANT, respectively, on the range of independent variables identified above for the following three "groups" of respondents:

1. Graduates who did not plan to enroll in a postsecondary institution but did in fact enroll versus those who did not plan to enroll and did not enroll;

2. Graduates who planned to enroll in a postsecondary institution but did not versus those who planned to enroll and did so; and,

3. Graduates who planned to enroll in a particular postsecondary institution but subsequently enrolled in some other postsecondary institution versus those who enrolled in the institution in which they planned to enroll.

In that the comparison groups in groups (2) and (3) above were of severely unequal sizes, the comparisons were performed using samples of the larger groups. Two measures - "foreign language grades" and "highest degree expected" - were excluded from the discriminant analyses due to large proportions of responses necessarily classified as "missing" (i.e., the 51 percent who took no foreign language courses in high school, and the 32 percent who were uncertain as to the highest degree they expected). A complete list of the initial survey of plans items employed as independent variables in this study is included as Appendix A.

Results

In general, the results of the first follow-up survey indicate that the vast majority of 1980 Kentucky high school graduates followed through on their general post-high school plans. Specifically, in the context of continued formal education after high school, 87 percent of the 1980 graduates who planned to enroll in a postsecondary educational institution actually enrolled, and that 20 percent of the graduates with non-education plans (primarily full-time civilian

employment) enrolled in some form of postsecondary education. Graduates with non-education plans who enrolled in postsecondary education were more than four times as likely to have enrolled and subsequently withdrawn than graduates who had planned to continue their education.

With regard to institutional choice in general, 60 percent of the enrolled education-bound graduates enrolled in Kentucky public universities, 13 percent enrolled in Kentucky private colleges, 10 percent enrolled in public community colleges, 13 percent enrolled in out-of-state colleges and universities, and the remaining five percent enrolled in other postsecondary institutions in Kentucky. In terms of consistency of actual enrollment with the institution the graduate expected to attend, the Kentucky public institutions - four-year, two-year, and vocational-technical - evidenced the strongest "initial retention" in that an average of 85.6 percent of the graduates expecting to enroll in such institutions actually did so; the Kentucky private colleges had the lowest rate at 75.5 percent. Among the 16.5 percent of the graduates who did not enroll in their expected institution, nearly half (48.1 percent) actually enrolled in a public two-year or four-year college in Kentucky. Further, Kentucky public four-year colleges "captured" 78 percent of students who expected to enroll out-of-state but did not, and 42 percent of students who expected to enroll in a Kentucky private college but did not; the public community colleges in turn "captured" 39 percent of the graduates who expected to attend a Kentucky public university but did not.

Tables 1 and 2 present the results of the Student-t comparisons and discriminant analysis, respectively for those employment-bound graduates who were enrolled and not enrolled in postsecondary

Table 1
Comparison of Group Means for Enrolled and Not Enrolled
Employment-Bound Graduates

Variable	Group Means		t	dF	p*
	Enrolled	Not Enrolled			
English grades	1.170	1.216	0.44	494	.662
Foreign language grades**	1.448	1.257	-0.91	129	.364
Mathematics grades	1.200	1.129	-0.70	473	.483
Sciences grades	1.238	1.305	0.66	466	.509
Social Studies grades	.952	1.177	2.01	471	.045
Class rank	2.267	2.378	0.76	496	.449
Academic motivation	2.489	2.521	0.37	497	.713
Mechanical Ability	2.678	2.805	1.26	496	.210
Artistic Ability	2.828	3.010	1.70	495	.089
Clerical Ability	2.761	2.644	-1.10	496	.272
Creative Writing Ability	2.841	2.946	1.08	497	.282
Scientific Ability	3.092	3.260	1.91	496	.057
Mathematical Ability	2.648	2.650	0.02	497	.984
Team member	1.943	1.898	-0.52	496	.606
Leadership	2.318	2.358	0.38	496	.703
Family income	2.713	2.353	-1.44	497	.150
Father's education	2.023	1.594	-2.24	497	.026
Mother's education	1.888	1.510	-2.54	495	.012
Highest degree expected**	.930	.459	-2.48	146	.014
Urban/rural location	3.128	3.701	2.46	497	.014
Time spent studying	1.557	1.579	0.15	497	.879
Future education plans	1.409	1.131	-2.28	497	.023
View of Ky job opportunities	1.386	1.449	0.52	496	.605
Expected post-HS income	1.235	1.006	-1.92	450	.055

* Two-tailed test of significance

**Excluded from subsequent analyses due to technical deficiencies; refer to text.

Table 2
Summary of Step-wise Discriminant Analysis of
Enrollment Status for Employment-Bound Graduates

General Description of Analysis

N	Eigen-value	Canon Corr	Wilks' Lambda	Chi Square	dF	p
402	.082	.275	.9244	31.104	7	.000

Step-wise Summary

Step	Variable	F-to-Enter	Wilks' Lambda	p
1	Mother's education	8.599	.9790	.004
2	Social studies grades	7.350	.9612	.000
3	Urban/rural location	4.964	.9494	.000
4	Expected post-HS income	2.970	.9424	.000
5	Clerical ability	2.129	.9373	.000
6	Scientific ability	1.889	.9274	.000
7	Artistic ability	1.239	.9244	.000

Classification Results

Group	Cases for Classification	Percent*	Percent Correctly Classified	Relative Percent Improvement
Enrolled	88	17.64	3.41	-80.67
Not Enrolled	411	82.36	97.57	86.42
Combined Groups (Wtd.)	499	70.95	80.96	34.46

* The "percent" representation in the cases available for classification is used in this table as a Bayesian "prior probability" for the purpose of calculating "relative percent improvement."

education. As reflected in Table 1 significant differences between enrolled and not enrolled employment-bound graduates were limited in number, and concentrated primarily in such measures of personal and family background as parental education and personal educational aspirations. In each case, the group means for the graduates who enrolled were "higher" than those for the graduates who were not enrolled. Similarly, the employment-bound graduates who actually enrolled had significantly higher Social Studies grades and self-rated scientific ability, were more often from urban (or more urban) hometowns, were significantly more committed to further formal education at some time after high school, and expected higher incomes during the first year after high school graduation.

In general, the results of the step-wise discriminant analysis presented in Table 2 confirm these findings. However, while the analysis does provide a basis for distinguishing between the enrolled and not enrolled employment-bound graduates, the value of the results may be limited in a practical sense as reflected in the results of the classification procedure. Specifically, while the discriminant function derived in the analysis resulted in a substantial improvement over chance levels in the identification of employment-bound graduates who implemented their plans (and thus did <u>not</u> enroll in postsecondary education), it was very ineffective in the identification of those who changed their plans and enrolled in postsecondary education, classifying such graduates correctly in only one of every five cases.

Tables 3 and 4 present the results of the Student-t comparisons and discriminant analysis, respectively, for the <u>education-bound</u> graduates who were enrolled and not enrolled in postsecondary education. As specified in Table 3, these two groups of <u>education-</u>

Table 3
Comparison of Group Means for Enrolled and Not Enrolled
Education-Bound Graduates

Variable	Group Means		t	dF	p*
	Enrolled	Not Enrolled			
English grades	.688	1.161	6.51	453	.000
Foreign language grades**	.656	1.121	4.85	226	.000
Mathematics grades	.892	1.141	2.99	447	.003
Sciences grades	.761	1.134	5.03	443	.000
Social Studies grades	.540	1.102	7.29	444	.000
Class rank	1.328	2.131	7.49	457	.000
Academic motivation	1.930	2.332	5.52	456	.000
Mechanical Ability	2.785	2.700	-1.09	457	.275
Artistic Ability	2.711	2.680	-0.33	457	.743
Clerical Ability	2.441	2.670	2.91	457	.004
Creative Writing Ability	2.527	2.813	3.77	457	.000
Scientific Ability	2.660	2.941	3.47	457	.001
Mathematical Ability	2.785	2.591	3.86	457	.000
Team member	1.758	1.862	1.56	457	.119
Leadership	2.059	2.129	0.94	455	.349
Family income	3.415	2.900	-2.41	456	.016
Father's education	3.169	2.100	-5.43	457	.000
Mother's education	2.954	2.214	-4.49	456	.000
Highest degree expected**	2.366	1.654	-7.01	344	.000
Urban/rural location	2.727	3.206	2.49	456	.013
Time spent studying	2.084	1.807	-2.52	457	.012
High school preparation	1.220	1.015	-3.55	457	.000
Close to home	.989	.956	-0.51	457	.608
Not expensive	1.044	1.150	1.59	456	.112
Credit by exam available	.510	.647	2.11	456	.036
Reputation field of interest	1.564	1.558	-0.12	457	.907
Can get financial aid	1.144	1.251	1.45	457	.148
Parents like it	1.079	.947	-1.96	456	.051
Friends like it	.599	.528	-1.13	457	.258
Counselor/teacher rec.	.445	.598	2.52	456	.012
Can get admitted	1.423	1.548	1.92	457	.055
Social life	1.083	1.066	-0.25	456	.802
Far enough from home	.898	.799	-1.29	457	.197

* Two-tailed test of significance

**Excluded from subsequent analyses due to technical deficiencies; refer to text.

Table 4
Summary of Step-wise Discriminant Analysis of
Enrollment Status for Education-Bound Graduates

General Description of Analysis

N	Eigen-value	Canon Corr	Wilks' Lambda	Chi Square	dF	p
428	.332	.499	.7508	119.825	15	.000

Step-wise Summary

Step	Variable	F-to-Enter	Wilks' Lambda	p
1	Class rank	55.020	.8856	.000
2	Father's education	19.427	.8469	.000
3	Social studies grades	12.779	.8221	.000
4	High school preparation	4.331	.8138	.000
5	Urban/rural location	4.375	.8054	.000
6	Artistic ability	4.603	.7967	.000
7	Friends like institution	2.991	.7911	.000
8	Counselor/teacher rec.	5.795	.7803	.000
9	Academic motivation	3.969	.7730	.000
10	English grades	2.247	.7688	.000
11	Leadership	1.621	.7620	.000
12	Time spent studying	1.577	.7592	.000
13	Parents like institution	1.448	.7565	.000
14	Can get admitted	2.027	.7528	.000
15	Clerical ability	1.120	.7508	.000

Classification results

Group	Cases for Classification	Percent*	Percent Correctly Classified	Relative Percent Improvement
Enrolled	256	55.77	77.34	48.77
Not Enrolled	203	44.23	65.51	38.16
Combined Groups (Wtd.)	459	50.67	72.11	43.46

* The "percent" representation in the cases available for classification is used in this table as a Bayesian "prior probability" for the purpose of calculating "relative percent improvement."

bound graduates differ significantly on all six academic background measures, and the primarily school-related ability self-ratings, with the graduates who subsequently enrolled uniformly reporting higher academic performance and abilities, respectively. Further, the graduates who actually enrolled had significantly higher family incomes, parental education levels, and personal educational aspirations than those who did not enroll, and also were more often from urban areas, spent more time studying in high school, and had a significantly higher opinion of the adequacy of their high school preparation than those who did not enroll. Few of the factors of possible importance in the choice of specific postsecondary education institution revealed significant differences between the two groups.

The results of the discriminant analysis of actual enrollment status of these education-bound students reported in Table 4 emphasize the influence of academic and certain personal and family background factors. Fifteen separate measures contributed uniquely to the differentiation of the two groups. The discriminant function derived in the analysis resulted in substantial improvement in the classification of cases over chance assignment levels for both the enrolled and not enrolled students. Overall, nearly three-fourths of the cases were correctly classified, representing a relative improvement in classification of more than 40 percent.

Finally, Tables 5 and 6 present Student-t comparison and discriminant analysis results regarding the consistency of actual enrollment institution with expected institution. As reflected in Table 5, statistically significant differences between graduates who enrolled in the institution in which they expected to enroll and those who enrolled in a different institution closely parallel

Table 5
Comparison of Group Means for Education-Bound Graduates
Enrolled in Their Expected/Planned Institution and
Education-Bound Graduates Enrolled in a Different/Unplanned Institution

Variable	Group Means		t	dF	p*
	Expected	Different			
English grades	.639	.952	7.13	1362	.000
Foreign language grades**	.599	.942	5.36	794	.000
Mathematics grades	.870	1.136	5.32	1338	.000
Sciences grades	.739	1.015	6.22	1340	.000
Social Studies grades	.528	.925	8.85	1342	.000
Class rank	1.303	1.796	7.34	1368	.000
Academic motivation	1.887	2.240	7.80	1366	.000
Mechanical Ability	2.736	2.730	-0.13	1367	.897
Artistic Ability	2.702	2.706	0.08	1368	.936
Clerical Ability	2.503	2.552	1.04	1368	.298
Creative Writing Ability	2.455	2.552	1.99	1368	.046
Scientific Ability	2.574	2.792	4.27	1368	.000
Mathematical Ability	2.285	2.515	4.63	1367	.000
Team member	1.766	1.809	1.03	1367	.305
Leadership	2.021	2.106	1.83	1364	.068
Family income	3.423	3.142	-2.10	1366	.036
Father's education	3.187	2.729	-3.71	1368	.000
Mother's education	3.026	2.592	-4.10	1367	.000
Highest degree expected**	2.426	1.939	-6.61	1134	.000
Urban/rural location	2.801	2.769	-0.27	1367	.784
Time spent studying	2.134	1.850	-4.04	1368	.000
High school preparation	1.259	1.100	-4.60	1368	.000
Close to home	1.035	.940	-2.37	1366	.018
Not expensive	1.045	1.078	0.84	1366	.402
Credit by exam available	.560	.581	0.55	1365	.582
Reputation field of interest	1.551	1.547	-0.12	1368	.906
Can get financial aid	1.107	1.208	2.17	1367	.030
Parents like it	1.034	.967	-1.63	1367	.102
Friends like it	.544	.511	-0.90	1368	.369
Counselor/teacher rec.	.451	.538	2.42	1366	.016
Can get admitted	1.345	1.408	1.48	1368	.140
Social life	1.049	1.077	0.66	1367	.509
Far enough from home	.801	.770	-0.67	1365	.503

* Two-tailed test of significance

**Excluded from subsequent analyses due to technical deficiencies; refer to text.

Table 6
Summary of Step-wise Discriminant Analysis of
Expected and Actual Institution of Enrollment for
Education-Bound Graduates

General Description of Analysis

N	Eigen-value	Canon Corr	Wilks' Lambda	Chi Square	dF	p
1298	.112	.317	.8992	136.842	14	.000

Step-wise Summary

Step	Variable	F-to-Enter	Wilks' Lambda	p
1	Social studies grades	75.259	.9451	.000
2	Academic motivation	17.814	.9323	.000
3	High School Preparation	7.804	.9267	.000
4	Mother's education	7.413	.9214	.000
5	Institution close to home	5.260	.9177	.000
6	Counselor/teacher rec.	4.113	.9148	.000
7	Can get financial aid	2.952	.9107	.000
8	Friends like institution	2.819	.9088	.000
9	Clerical ability	3.061	.9066	.000
10	Time spent studying	2.942	.9045	.000
11	Creative writing ability	2.625	.9027	.000
12	English grades	2.600	.9008	.000
13	Artistic ability	1.285	.8999	.000
14	Father's education	1.018	.8992	.000

Classification Results

Group	Cases for Classification	Percent*	Percent Correctly Classified	Relative Percent Improvement
Same Inst.	903	65.91	89.59	69.46
Different Inst.	467	34.09	27.19	-20.24
Combined Groups (Wtd.)	1370	55.06	68.32	29.51

* The "percent" representation in the cases available for classification is used in this table as a Bayesian "prior probability" for the purpose of calculating "relative percent improvement."

in fact and direction (and to a lesser extent, magnitude) the differences between education-bound graduates who subsequently enrolled and those who did not (reported in Table 3). Specifically, the graduates who implemented their specific educational plans by enrolling in their respective expected institutions had significantly higher academic performance in high school and self-ratings on school-related abilities than the graduates who enrolled in institutions different than originally planned. Further, the graduates enrolled in different institutions had significantly lower family incomes, parental education, and personal educational aspirations, spent less time studying, and had a lower opinion of the adequacy of their educational preparation in high school. In sole contrast to the results for general enrollment status of education-bound graduates, there were no significant differences between the "expected institution" and "different institution" groups on the urban-rural location of the graduate's hometown.

Table 6 summarizes the results of the step-wise discriminant analysis, and as was the case for the corresponding analysis of general enrollment status, emphasizes the relative importance of academic and family background measures in differentiating the two groups. However, contrary to the previous analysis, the discriminant function results in an improvement in classification over chance levels only for those graduates who actually enroll in the expected institution. While there is an overall improvement in classification accuracy, the discriminant function, as was the case in the identification of employment-bound graduates who actually enrolled, results in a decrease of some 20 percent over chance levels in the correct classification or identification of graduates who enroll in an institution different than the one planned.

Discussion

The results presented in the preceding section are both encouraging and discouraging. The results are encouraging in that to a large extent they confirm the conventional wisdom which is the basis for current planning efforts; on the other hand, the results are somewhat discouraging for that same reason. Further, while various enrollment groups could be distinguished on the basis of the background and opinion measures employed, thus confirming the general relevance of these measures to the issues examined, the value of these distinctions was generally limited in terms of improving the efficacy with which group membership can be identified or predicted.

With respect to the results per se, it is interesting to note the similarities of patterns across the three sets of comparisons. In terms of actual enrollment, those employment-bound and education-bound graduates who changed their plans tended to move in opposite directions on common measures - the former were more education-like and the latter were less education-like than their colleagues who did not change plans. A direct comparison of these two groups may prove informative. Similarly, a direct comparison of education-bound graduates who <u>did not enroll</u> with graduates who enrolled in an institution <u>other than the planned or expected institution</u> should be useful in that these two groups showed considerable similarities in the fact, direction, and (to a somewhat lesser extent) magnitude of differences from their comparison groups.

The results of this study are sufficiently limited and preliminary that specific conclusions are properly deferred pending further analyses incorporating data from subsequent follow-up surveys. While the results provide some additional relevant insight as to the

factors influencing high school graduates' implementation of educational plans, the strongest suggestion is that the controlling influences flow from factors beyond those included in this study.

APPENDIX A

Listing of Initial Survey of Plans Items Employed as Independent Variables

A. Academic Background*

1. Grade average in English
2. Grade average in foreign languages
3. Grade average in mathematics
4. Grade average in sciences
5. Grade average in social studies
6. Compared with other students in your high school class, how would you describe your achievement since beginning the ninth grade? (Class rank)

B. Self-Ratings on School- and Career-Related Characteristics*

How do you rate yourself in comparison with your classmates in the following school-related and career-related characteristics?

1. Academic motivation
2. Mechanical ability
3. Artistic ability
4. Clerical ability
5. Creative writing ability
6. Scientific ability
7. Mathematical ability
8. Ability to get along with others
9. Ability to work with others

C. Personal and Family Background, etc.

1. What is the approximate total income of your parents or legal guardian before taxes this year?
2. What is the highest level of education completed by your father or male guardian?
3. What is the highest level of education completed by your mother or female guardian?
4. What is the highest level of education you plan to complete beyond high school?
5. How would you describe where you currently live? (Urban-rural)
6. On the average, how many hours per week did you spend studying and doing homework during your high school years?
7. How well do you feel your high school prepared you to succeed in the institution you are most likely to attend?

---

* The response scales for the six academic background and nine ability self-ratings were of inverse order--high grades and high abilities are therefore reflected in low "scores"

D. Items for Employment-Bound Graduates Only

1. Do you have any plans to continue your education?

2. In your opinion, how good are the employment opportunities open to you in Kentucky?

3. What do you think your income will be during your first year after high school graduation?

E. Items for Education-Bound Graduates Only

How important is each of the following factors in your selecting the postsecondary institution you are most likely to attend?

1. The school is close to home
2. It is not expensive
3. It offers an advanced placement and/or credit by examination program which will permit me to skip some courses
4. It has a good reputation in my field of interest
5. I believe I can get financial aid there
6. My parents like it
7. My friends like it
8. My counselor or teacher suggested it
9. I believe I can get admitted there
10. It offers a good social life
11. It is far enough from home so that I feel I will be on my own